

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

In view of the appeal brief filed on November 6, 2007, the Examiner has reopened prosecution of this application.

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are now in the application. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are subject to examination. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 6 been added. Claim 4 been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 3 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,754,184 to Ring et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 1 now includes a step of: converting the relative color values into absolute color values in a ratio corresponding to a ratio of the values of the white point of the first device-dependent color space over the values of the white point of the device-independent color space. Support for the changes can be found by referring to the application at page 22, line 19 through page 23, line 5, for example.

In column 7, lines 20 to 23 of Ring et al. teach: "Conversion from input CIE XYZ's (42) to intermediate CIE XYZ's (40) accounts for differences in a human

observers state of chromatic adaptation for the input and reference viewing conditions”.

Column 7, lines 26-30, however teach that these signals are scaled using the quotient destination/source. This is also shown in the (scaler) formula located between lines 40 and 45 in column 7. Only the quotient from the standard to the input signals is formed.

The invention as defined by claim 1 specifies that the absolute color values are obtained from a ratio of the source color space over the destination color space. This is explained at page 22, line 22 through page 23, line 5 of the specification. In contrast to claim 1, however, the alleged “absolute color values” that are taught by Ring et al. are obtained using the opposite ratio. Ring et al. do not anticipate the claimed invention because of the difference in the ratio.

Furthermore, the step of claim 1 that has been referenced above reads, “converting the relative color values into absolute color values”. Neither Ring et al. nor Woolfe et al., which was cited in the rejection of claim 4, teach converting relative color values into absolute color values.

In the prior art transformation from the device dependent color space to the device independent color space (PCS), the content of the relative “Rendering Intent” in an ICC-Profile is calculated in accordance to the ICC specification by

dividing the absolute PCS values by the media white point values. For the transformation from PCS to the device dependent color space, an inverse transformation must be calculated and is put into the ICC profile. When both transformations are used to convert from device dependent color space 1 to PCS to device dependent color space 2, and the white points of both devices differ from each other, this transformation is equivalent to a “simple von Kries”-Chromatic adaptation. This is described, for example, in the application at page 11, equations (4). This procedure is recommended by the ICC, and is implemented in state of the art “Color Management Modules”.

In contrast to the prior art discussed above, the invention applies a better “Chromatic Adaptation (CA) method” by first calculating back to “correct” absolute PCS values. Then the CA method is applied and the relative PCS values are calculated from adapted absolute PCS values. Then these values are used as input values to the second ICC profile. Applicants believe this should be clear by the limitations of claim 4 that have been incorporated into claim 1.

With these achieved absolute color values, the chromatic adaptation transformation can now be processed.

Claim 6 has been added to even further distinguish the invention from the prior art. Support for the claim can be found by referring to the application at page

22, line 19 through page 23, line 5. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest the limitations defined in claim 6.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 2 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,754,184 to Ring et al. in view of Finlayson et al. (IS&T/SPIE Electronic Imaging, SPIE Vol. 4300, January 2001) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Neither Ring et al. nor Finlayson et al. teach or suggest the features added to claim 1.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 4 been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,754,184 to Ring et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,850,342 to Woolfe et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As explained above, the limitations of claim 4 have been added into claim 1. Claim 1 is not suggested by the cited prior art for the reasons given above with regard to the deficiency in the teaching of Ring et al.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 5 been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,754,184 to Ring et al. in view of Kim Jin-Seo et al. (Development of Color Management System Prototype, IEEE, 1998) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Neither Ring et al. nor Kim Jin-Seo et al. teach or suggest the features added to claim 1.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-6 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$1050.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/767,577  
Amdt. Dated July 18, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/  
Laurence A. Greenberg  
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW:cgm

July 18, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101